EXHIBIT 20

THE REAL STORY

OF HOW I WON

THE TOUR DE FRANCE



POSITIVELY FALSE FLOYD LANDIS two later, Amber was talking on 1g to a friend about my being let 7e had been putting off telling 1ation because we didn't know ught all the publicity had been he race. When Amber hung up, Dad got fired?" It made no sense 1gest bike race in the world, and 1 on the team anymore? Amber 1 the three of us could talk about 1 ded to know what was going on

nply as she could. "Daddy's been plained. "And of course he didn't it and he's going to win."

a done deal. "When it comes to nobody tells him no," she said. In and Amber warned her that kids and that if anyone said anything they didn't understand. "Mom," she said, sounding like me in a when Amber told me about it. The rear my T-shirt the first day of a yellow T-shirt in Paris that says, France," and she'd worn it on the

o seemed to be a done deal to the ne results of my B sample were

announced, there was no more news to report, because we hadn't yet received the document packet. Media attention faded quickly, and most people probably assumed that my case was over—they thought that I was guilty, and that's it.

Howard Jacobs was sitting in his Los Angeles law office when the telephone rang. It was Travis Tygart, the head lawyer for USADA. Howard had dealt with Tygart for years while representing other accused athletes, and now they were both working on my case. This phone call was unusual, though: Terry Madden, the CEO of USADA, was also on the line. Howard knew Madden, but rarely communicated with him. "From everything we've read about Floyd, he's a straightforward, no-BS guy," Tygart began. "We think he can help us clean up the sport and get to the bigger names in cycling."

I had just won the Tour de France. Who was a bigger name in cycling than me? . . . The only person who would be bigger than me is someone who had won the race more times than I had—say, seven times. It was easy to figure out what he meant. USADA wanted me to give information that would show that Lance Armstrong used performance-enhancing drugs during his racing career.

"If he's willing to do that, we can make him a great deal," Tygart said. Howard asked what Madden and Tygart had in mind, and they ended up offering a suspension of less than a year, so that I would be cleared and able to race the 2007 Tour de France. A suspension that short would be unprecedented. The only things I had to do in order to end the mess relatively

POSITIVELY FALSE

da

rei

sta

be

thr

bai by

To

lab

Pas

ind

eye spo

Ar

the

Flo

hon

for

cycl

prot dopi

that

so h

(Ma)7

quickly and get my life back were to give them information on "bigger names" and to accept the suspension.

"That's completely out of the question," I told Howard when he presented the deal to me. "In fact, I find everything about it offensive." First of all, they were assuming that I was guilty even before we received the full test results. Why would I negotiate for a suspension when I'm innocent? They were trying to use me as a pawn to get to Lance. They didn't really care whether I was a cheater. If they could find an even bigger case than mine, they'd practically let me go, without regard to whether or not I had done what they were alleging.

What didn't make sense to me was why they were going after Lance in the first place. By then, Lance had been retired for more than a year. USADA is supposed to protect the integrity of athletic competition by fighting against doping. It gets about 60 percent of its funding from your tax dollars, and the U.S. Olympic Committee funds the rest. Why would they actively pursue someone who didn't even compete anymore?

"It's how they operate," Howard said. "They're after high-profile cases, because those are like ammunition for them to go beg for more money." Howard explained that USADA is a young organization, founded in 2000, that is trying to prove itself. After BALCO, the 2003 Bay Area doping scandal, USADA made an appeal to Congress that doping permeated all levels of big-time sports, and that more money was needed to combat dopers. Its federal funding had been doubled, and now they needed to show results.

te to give them information the suspension.

e question," I told Howard e. "In fact, I find everything iey were assuming that I was the full test results. Why on when I'm innocent? They to get to Lance. They didn't er. If they could find an even ractically let me go, without one what they were alleging. me was why they were going then, Lance had been retired is supposed to protect the on by fighting against dopof its funding from your tax c Committee funds the rest. sue someone who didn't even

Howard said. "They're after tose are like ammunition for oney." Howard explained that ion, founded in 2000, that is LCO, the 2003 Bay Area dop-1 appeal to Congress that doping-time sports, and that more dopers. Its federal funding had needed to show results.

But I didn't have any evidence to give them about Lance, anyway. If Lance had been doping, he sure didn't tell me about it. He would have been a fool to do so. Ever since his first Tour win in 1999, the press and all sorts of different authorities had suspected Lance of doping. The year I joined Postal, in 2002, the team was under doping investigation by French officials, though the case was dropped for lack of evidence. Books have been written with allegations, and people who once worked for him have made claims—but nothing has ever held up in court. All I know is that I never saw anything to indicate that Lance used performance-enhancing drugs, that his blood and urine were tested more than anyone else's, and that he never returned a positive test.

Later, with Will, I couldn't shake my anger about the offer. "If USADA is so sure Lance was a doper, then why didn't their supposedly bulletproof scientific drug tests catch him?" I said. "At this point, whether or not he was doping isn't really even the point." To me the point was: They didn't catch him. They had all those years, and they didn't catch him. They needed to *let it go*. It was over. To focus on Lance was a complete waste of time, and even downright negligent, considering USADA's mission. No possible good could come from rooting up the past. Instead, they should be using all their resources on the problems of the present—like how their tests had snagged someone who didn't use testosterone.

"What a bunch of backward-looking idiots," Will said. "They have no regard for the truth."

The sport of cycling is sick and in need of major reform. The UCI has way too much control over athletes' lives. We riders need to form a true union to protect ourselves. Without us, there is no race. But as it is, the UCI profits from our efforts, and then fails miserably to protect us from injustice.

By organizing, riders could have more power in salary negotiations with teams and more collective force in fighting unjust anti-doping policies that lead to terrible consequences and do nothing but kill fans' enthusiasm for cycling.

My case should never have happened.

The Operación Puerto scandal should not have impacted the sport the way it did. Officials should have had enough proof to convict before they forced teams to kick riders out of the 2006 Tour.

11

le

20

 $id\epsilon$

ser

fro.

has

the

The problem is that the way the UCI rules are set up, all it takes is a suspicion to halt a rider's career and put his reputation in doubt. What's to stop me from starting a rumor right now and wrecking someone's life? It's way too easy to presume guilt. There needs to be accountability for cases where there is harmful presumption without solid proof.

Some of the riders allegedly linked to Operación Puerto chose to retire from cycling rather than deal with the hassle, while others were cleared by their national federations to race